

REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Office Action of October 6, 2008. Reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-22, 24-31, 33, 34, and 37-60 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Of the above claims, 5-8, 13-18 and 24-28 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 19-22, 29-31, 33, 34 and 37-60 are rejected. In response to the Office Action, claims 9, 40, and 42 are amended. Claim 39 is canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 19-22, 29-31, 33, 34 and 37-60 are now pending in the present application and are believed to be in proper condition for allowance, with claims 5-8-13-18 and 24-28 remaining withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-4, 9-12, 19-22, 29-31, 33-34 and 37-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0067400 to Kawase et al in view of European Patent No. 1 071 117 A2 to Yamazaki, U.S. Patent No. 5,679,167 to Muehlberger (hereinafter the ‘167 patent) and U.S. Patent No. 4,328,257 to Muehlberger et al. (hereinafter the ‘257 patent)

Here, the independent claims are claims 1, 9, and 19. The Examiner has chosen to combine Kawase, Yamazaki, Muehlberger, and Muehlberger et al. to teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention.

Applicant does not think that cited documents teach the limitation of claims 1, 19, and 29, particularly, “the object is transferred in the first chamber along a first direction and the plasma generating device is moved in the first chamber along the rail and along a second direction intersecting with the first direction and in a direction parallel to a side of the object” in a manner that is sufficiently strong to be a basis for the rejection.

To begin with, the Examiner explicitly notes that Kawase et al. and Yamazaki fail to disclose the plasma generating device is capable of being moved in the first chamber along a second direction intersecting with the first direction and in a direction parallel to an edge of the substrate. By this amendment, this limitation (already present in independent claims 1 and 19) is incorporated into independent claim 9.

Further, the ‘167 patent only teaches (*see* col. 7, rows 3-5) “[a] gun motion mechanism 15 is coupled to produce oscillating yaw or other motions of the plasma gun within the chamber 12, where desired” without reciting a relation between the direction of motion and the object being subjected to the plasma treatment or a side of the object. The Examiner fails to cite any reason why the motion would necessarily or desirably be moved parallel to a side of the object.

Furthermore, it is unclear which part in the ‘257 patent corresponds with the claimed rail. Even if guide rods 92 and 93 are considered to be the claimed rail, the carriage mechanism 70 would be slideable by guide rods 92 and 93 (*see* col. 5, lines 54-57) and not the plasma generating device as claimed.

With respect to the rejection of claim 20, the claim recites “by the plasma generating device” although “the ink jet device” is cited in the rejection. Applicant submits that the rejection is improper as the Examiner has not identified how the limitations of the claim have been taught by the prior art.

Thus, claims 1, 19, and 29 are patentable over the provided prior art, and therefore the other pending claims, all of which are dependent upon one of these three claims, must also be patentable for at least the reasons described above.

Finally, Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to include the limitations of dependent claim 39 and canceled claim 39. Amended claim 9 is supported by claim 10 and related description. Applicant has amended claims 40 and 42 in like manner. Although Yamazaki et al. teach providing a plurality of processing chambers, they do not show, “the object is transferred in the first chamber, the second chamber and the third chamber”, for example.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan D. Schlaifer, Reg. No. 61,719/
Jonathan D. Schlaifer
Registration No. 61,719

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000
(202) 585-8080 (Fax)
Customer No. 22204

Dated: January 6, 2009